

REMARKS**Claim Summary**

Claim 1 is amended to recite “selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data link, a destination module...wherein the destination module is selected without employing the data link; informing, by the controller, the selected destination module.” Claim 9 is amended to recite “a controller, uncoupled from the data link, coupled to each destination module.” Claim 20 is amended to recite “wherein the destination module is selected by the controller uncoupled from the switching system.” Claim 23 is amended to recite “selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data links, a destination module...allocating, by a controller, a time slot.” These changes are based at least on FIG. 2, and accompanying description on page 10, lines 5-9, page 7, lines 23-25, and page 5, lines 1-5 of the Application as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of claims 1-5, 9-13, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,760,570 (Acampora)

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-5, 9-13, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Acampora as herein amended.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data link, a destination module,” and “the destination module is selected without employing the data link.” Applicant respectfully submits that Acampora does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1.

Acampora discloses a switching system that receives packets at N inputs and forwards the received packets to N outputs. See col. 4, lines 7-10 of Acampora. The packets arriving at each input are placed directly on a separate broadcast bus (equated to Applicant's data link) and each output (equated to Applicant's destination modules) receives the packets via a separate bus interface unit connected to the broadcast bus. Each packet has an address and the address is associated with the respective output. Further, the bus interface unit (equated to Applicant's controller) coupled to the broadcast bus, interfaces each output with a plurality of inputs. The bus interface unit includes a packet filter that allows the packets addressed to the associated output and blocks all other packets. See col. 4, lines 47- 50 of Acampora. Thus in Acampora, the output is selected by employing the bus interface unit which is coupled to the broadcast bus (equated to Applicant's data link). In contrast, Applicant's claim, as amended, recites "selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data link, a destination module." Further, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that "the destination module is selected without employing the data link."

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Acampora does not disclose "selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data link, a destination module," and "the destination module is selected without employing the data link." Applicant therefore submits that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Acampora, and therefore the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) of claim 1, as amended, is overcome. Applicant requests that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Regarding independent claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that the above discussed arguments apply equally to the limitations of claim 9, as amended. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that claim 9 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-5, 10-13, and 15-16 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9, which are shown to be allowable for the reasons given above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-5, 10-13, and 15-16 are in proper condition for allowance and requests that claims 2-5, 10-13, and 15-16 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 6, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 4,760,570 (Acampora)

Dependent claims 6 and 14 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 6 and 14 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims. Applicant requests that claims 6 and 14 now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 7, 8, and 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 4,760,570 (Acampora) and in view of US 4,392,222 (Ando)

Regarding independent claims 20 and 23, Applicant respectfully submits that the above discussed arguments, in view of Acampora, apply equally to the limitations of claims 20 and 23 “the destination module is selected by the controller uncoupled from the switching system,” and “selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data links.”

Further, Ando discloses a circuit switching system that includes a monitor circuit and a central control unit. The monitor circuit detects a call request signal from a terminal and passes the call request signal to the central control unit. The central control unit analyzes the number of destination terminals and assigns a time slot on the time division multiplex trunk lines. See col. 3, lines 38-42 of Ando. However, in Ando, the central control unit is placed within the switching system and is coupled to the trunk lines/highways. Also, in Ando, the central control unit is simply assigning a time slot, and not selecting the destination terminal. In contrast, Applicant’s amended claims 20 and 23 recite “the destination module is selected by the controller uncoupled from the switching system,” and “selecting, by a controller uncoupled from the data links.”

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 20 and 23 are not obvious in view of the combination of Acampora and Ando, and therefore that the rejection of claims 20 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a), as amended, is overcome. Applicant requests that claims 20 and 23 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 7, 8, 17-19, 21, 22, and 24 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, 20 and 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 7, 8, 17-19, 21, 22, and 24, and requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims. Applicant requests that claims 7, 8, 17-19, 21, 22, and 24 now be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/Steven May/</u>	<u>01/22/2008</u>
Steven A. May	Date
Attorney for Applicant	
Registration No. 44,912	
Tel. No. 847/576-3635	
Fax No. 847/576-3750	